

REMARKS

With claims 126, 130, 132-138, 141, 145-146, 150, 152-158, 161, 165-166, 170, 172-178, 181, 185-186, 190, 192-198, 201, and 205-277 previously pending, with this amendment claims 126, 130, 132-138, 141, 145-146, 150, 152-158, 161, 165-166, 170, 172-178, 181, 185-186, 190, 192-198, 201, 205-212, 224-230, 242-248 and 260-266 have been cancelled.

Accordingly the claims now pending are 213-223, 231-241, 249-259, and 267-277.

I. Summary Of Interview

An interview between Examiner Yuwen Pan and the undersigned, as well as Ernest Bodner, and Edwin Wong, was held on October 18, 2005 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Alexandria, Virginia. The interview was conducted to further prosecution of this application by reducing the amount of time required for the Examiner to review the significant number of claims and potential responses to claim rejections based on Crisler et al (US Patent No. 5,278,833, hereinafter 'Crisler').

Following the interview, the Examiner submitted an Interview Summary form (PTOL-413) stating the substance of the interview as follows:

"[C]laimed invention was demonstrated by the applicants. According to the demonstration, the claimed invention was classified into two parts, single reservation and double reservation. The direction of the application is totally based on the applicant's amendment after final. If the applicants only select the double reservation part of claims and minor correction of the selected part, this case might rise to the stage of allowance. However, the examiner reserves the right of updating the search based on the amendment after final and reopening of prosecution if necessary."

Applicants agree with this Interview Summary provided by Examiner Pan.

Pursuant to the requirement of the Interview Summary form (PTOL-413), Applicants further submit the following substance of the interview.

In the interview, Applicants presented the claims classified into two portions - (1) "double reservation" claims with independent claims 213, 231, 249, and 267, wherein Applicants directed arguments toward claim 213; and (2) "single reservation" claims that included the remaining independent claims, with Applicants' comments directed toward claim 126. After presenting arguments, Examiner Pan expressed his belief that the "double reservation" claims were in condition for allowance. Examiner Pan expressed some concern over the allowability of the "single reservation" claims without elaborating.

Applicants proposed cancellation of the "single reservation" claims with reservation of the right to pursue those claims in a continuation. Applicants would maintain only the "double reservation claims," so that all pending claims would be in condition for allowance. Subject to his reservations indicated in the Interview Summary, Examiner Pan agreed with this course of action. Accordingly, this amendment cancels all claims except independent claims 213, 231, 249, and 267, and any claims dependent on these claims. The remaining claims, thus, only constitute the double reservation claims and are believed in condition for allowance.

The arguments Applicants presented to support the allowability of the double reservation claims, namely directed to claim 213, are as follows:

First, the Office Action states that a first signal including a request to transmit a second request signal is provided in Crisler. But, since Crisler switches from a "random mode" to a "reservation mode" as illustrated in its Figs. 2a-2c once a first request is

received to allow data transmission, no request to provide a second request signal can be granted (or reasonably made) in Crisler.

Second, the Office Action states that the STATUS FEEDBACK in Crisler provides applicant's "second signal" transmitted from the controller to a node to allocate a timeslot for a second request. However, the STATUS FEEDBACK only indicates which requester has a reserved time slot. A requester not identified by the STATUS FEEDBACK must send a "new" signal, as indicated in col. 6, lines 6-7 of Crisler. No additional timeslot is allocated as claimed.

Additionally, during the interview, Examiner Pan raised an objection to the language "node" and "signal" being used in the claims as being too broad. Specifically, the Examiner requested that the broad language "node" be changed to the more narrow language of "pager" and that the broad language "signal" be changed to some other language. In response, Applicants argued that the specification supports the broader language "node" to describe the communication unit in Applicants' claims. Applicants pointed out that a communication unit in Applicants' specification is described as a "two-way" communication unit, that the communication unit is called a "pager computer", that the communication unit is capable of sending longer "packetized data" messages, that the communication unit may contain a pressure sensitive writing pad which may be used for sketching foreign characters and graphics. As such, Applicants argued that the communication unit considered by Applicants at the filing of the parent patent application was more sophisticated than a typical "pager" available at the time of the filing of the original specification and that the choice of the word "pager computer" was chosen by the applicant as the best available language at the time of the filing of the original

specification to describe a device capable of transmitting and receiving long packetized data messages. Examiner Pan agreed with Applicants' arguments and didn't pursue this matter further.

Examiner Pan agreed, after presentation of these arguments, that the "double reservation" claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259, and 267-277 now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Examiner Pan further agreed with Applicant's proposed amendment of claims 257 (and corresponding claims 221, 239 and 275) to overcome claim objections discussed in the Office Action.

II. Response To Office Action Rejections/Objections

A. Claim Objections

The Office Action states that claim 257 should be amended to be dependent upon claim 249. However, as Applicants pointed out in the Interview of October 18, 2005, claim 257 should be dependent upon claim 256 to maintain antecedent basis with the language "the frequency that the first node is assigned" in claim 256. Claim 256 is then dependent upon claim 249. Accordingly claim 257 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 256. Similarly, claims 221, 239 and 275 that correspond to claim 257 have been amended to be dependant upon a preceding claim to maintain antecedent basis. Claims 220, 221, 238, 239, 274, 275, 256 and 257 have all further been amended to remove wording to broaden their scope. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claim objections can now be withdrawn.

B. Section 102 Rejection

All the remaining claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259, and 267-277 in the present application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crisler. Based on the arguments presented in the Interview Summary above, all these remaining claims are now believed allowable as not anticipated 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Crisler.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, all of the pending claims 213-223, 231-241, 249-259, and 267-277 of the present application are now all believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with this response. Should a fee be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 06-1325.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/2/05

By: Thomas A. Ward
Thomas A. Ward
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800